Hi Alan, thanks as always. Here are the questions. As you know we're looking for sound bites, but I know it may not as easy as a sentence. If it's easier for people to send a citation, that works too, and I can read it, draft something, and make sure it's accurate. Here's the example I'm using for pesticide spray buffers on non-fish bearing streams:

Oregon: none, no voluntary or regulatory programs; Washington: 50 feet, regulatory program; California: XX feet riparian buffer, regulatory program

1. Riparian buffers, medium and small fish bearing streams – what are the buffer requirements for Oregon, CA, and WA for small and medium fish bearing streams? Are the actions regulatory, voluntary or both? If it's voluntary, is there tracking, monitoring and an enforceable mechanism?

Summary Response: Riparian buffers on private lands for medium and small fish bearing streams in all three states are established by regulation.

- Oregon's buffers are 70' with a 20' no cut on medium, and 50' with a 20' no cut on small.
- Washington's are at least a 50' no cut on both. Where and to what extent you can harvest beyond the no cut zone varies by stream type, width, site class, basal area. The RMZ can be from 90' to 200'.
- California - This buffer width (on one side of the watercourse) varies from 50 to 150 feet for Class I (domestic water use source) and Class II (fish-bearing) streams.

Detailed Response

Oregon's requirements include a 20' core no-harvest buffer for trees, a 10' buffer for understory vegetation, and variable density and basal area requirements in a riparian management area of variable width. In Oregon the riparian buffer width is dependent on the stream type (fish-bearing, domestic water source, or neither fish nor domestic water source) and the size of the stream (based on flow volume, and classified as small, medium or large)

Oregon riparian buffers for streams on ***private*** lands in the Coast Range – regulatory
Medium fish bearing streams – 70'–20' no cut
Small fish bearing streams – 50'–20' no cut
Medium drinking water streams – 50'
Small drinking water streams – 20'

Washington riparian buffers for streams on ***private*** lands west of the Cascades
Generally, there is a 50' no cut buffer Washington private land has the most complicated rules. Where and to what extent you can harvest varies by stream type, width, site class, basal area, and the option you choose (there are three harvest options – a no cut buffer, a thin from below option in the inner zone (meeting shade targets and leaving 57 trees), and an option that allows you to concentrate leave trees in closest to the water).

California

California specifies the width of riparian management areas, known as Watercourse and Lake Protection Zones (WLPZs), as a function of the watercourse classification and the slope angle of the adjacent land. This width (on one side of the watercourse) varies from 50 to 150 feet for Class I (domestic water use source) and Class II (fish-bearing) streams. Class III streams (no aquatic life present, but may deliver sediment) have a variable buffer width that is assigned by the consulting forester. Acceptable silvicultural prescriptions vary by watercourse classification. For Class I and II streams, this means leaving 50% canopy cover in a well-distributed manner in the WLPZ, with additional requirements. Most lakes likely fall into Classes I and II, and receive protection as specified for such waters.

2. Riparian buffers, non-fish bearing streams - what are the buffer requirements for Oregon, CA, and WA for small non-fish bearing streams? Are the actions regulatory, voluntary or both? If it's voluntary, is there tracking, monitoring and an enforceable mechanism?

Summary Response for buffers on non-fish bearing streams

Riparian buffers on small non-fish bearing streams in all three states are established by regulation.

- Oregon- There are no required buffers on small non-fish bearing streams in the coastal area.

- Washington – There is a 50' no cut buffer on perennial non-fish bearing streams for a specified distance from the fish bearing stream. If the Np is >1000 from the fish stream, the buffer is applied to 500' of the stream. If the Np is >300<1000' from the fish stream, the buffer is applied to 300' or 50% of the entire length of the stream, whichever is longer. If the Np stream is <300' from the fish stream, the entire length of the Np stream is buffered. For Np streams >1001 from fish streams, a designated % of the stream must have a 50' buffer.

- California - Class III streams (no aquatic life present, but may deliver sediment) have a variable buffer width that is assigned by the consulting forester

- Oregon riparian buffers for non-fish bearing streams in the Coastal Range- actions are regulatory
  - Medium non-fish bearing streams – 50'
  - Small non-fish bearing streams – 0
- Washington riparian buffers for non-fish bearing streams on private lands west of the Cascades
  - WA Private (West), required 50 foot no cut for 500 feet above confluence with a fish bearing stream, and 56' radial buffer centered on stream intersection points, headwater springs and sensitive features (seeps, alluvial fans, etc). Other than that, there is only a 30' equipment limitation zone. This is a weak point of the forest and fish strategy from a water quality perspective
- California riparian buffers for non-fish bearing streams
  - Class III streams (no aquatic life present, but may deliver sediment) have a variable buffer width that is assigned by the consulting forester. Acceptable silvicultural prescriptions vary by watercourse classification. For Class I and II streams, this means

leaving 50% canopy cover in a well-distributed manner in the WLPZ, with additional requirements.

3. Roads – how do OR, CA, and WA manage their active, inactive, and legacy roads? Are the actions regulatory, voluntary or both? If it's voluntary, is there tracking, monitoring and an enforceable mechanism?

4. Landslides – how do OR, CA, and WA identify, track, and manage landslides that are known to cause water quality problems? Are the actions regulatory, voluntary or both? If it's voluntary, is there tracking, monitoring and an enforceable mechanism?

Oregon – Oregon's regulations established to address landslides focus on reducing risk of serious bodily injury or death caused by shallow, rapidly moving landslides. The regulations do not focus on impacts of landslides to water quality. In its response letter to our proposed decision, the State did cite two other regulations that require trees and snags to be left along type N streams subject to rapidly moving landslides. However, the intent of these regulations is to provide large wood delivery to the downstream fish-bearing streams, not to protect water quality. The only voluntary measure the State offered to address landslides is when landowners can leave trees on landslide prone slopes that will eventually contribute large wood to fish-bearing streams. The State did not provide how this measure was tracked or evaluated.

Washington – Washington's "landslide rules" address the potential for forest management related landslides that could deliver sediment or debris to public resources or threaten public safety. The rules are complex and tiered and could result in the applicant having to go through a SEPA process and implementing specific mitigation measures or conditions designed to avoid accelerating rates and magnitudes of mass wasting that could deliver sediment or debris to public resources. I am not aware of voluntary measures provided by the State.

California